



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re Application of: Henry M. Hund, Jr. et al.)
For: Refuse Collection Vehicle)
Having Multiple Collection) Art Unit: 3652
Assemblies)
Serial No.: 10/612,324) Examiner: Charles A. Fox
Filed: July 3, 2003)

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

October 6, 2004

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is an Amendment/Response to Office Action in connection with the application identified above and a postcard receipt addressed to Applicant's attorney. Please file the Response, mark the postcard with the date of receipt and return it to the undersigned attorney. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David J. Hill
(Registration No. 28,427)
Attorney for Applicants
Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C.
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2500
(423) 756-3000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed, with postage prepaid, to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 6, 2004.

Donna Guy
Date of signature: October 6, 2004



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Henry M. Hund, Jr. et al.)
For: Refuse Collection Vehicle)
Having Multiple Collection) Art Unit: 3652
Assemblies)
Serial No.: 10/612,324) Examiner: Charles A. Fox
Filed: July 3, 2003)

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

October 6, 2004

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 29, 2004. Claims 18-30 are pending in the application. Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,401,407 of Breckenridge in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al. Claims 18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,861,580 of Moore et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al. Claims 19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,401,407 of Breckenridge in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,952,890 of Armstrong. Claims 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,401,407 of Breckenridge in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,204,789 of Riedl et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,952,890 of Armstrong, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,026,104 of Pickrell. Objections have been raised to claims 25 and 26 for informalities

in the designations of the subparagraphs. Objection has been raised to claims 25-30 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants have now amended the specification to make clear that the terms "hydraulic actuators", "actuators", "hydraulic cylinders" and "cylinders", all of which were used in the specification as filed, are equivalent terms. Applicants have also amended claim 25 (and by dependency therefrom) claims 26-30 in order to incorporate therein the limitations of claim 18. Finally, Applicants have amended claims 24 and 26 to correct informalities in the designations of the subparagraphs.

Applicants offer the following remarks to address the rejections of their claims and respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of such amendments and remarks. Since no claims are being added to the application beyond the number previously paid for, the filing of this Amendment/Response does not require the payment of a fee for additional claims.